



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/023,297	12/17/2001	Sharadha Vijay	CDR-01-004 (977-020)	7602
25537	7590	10/20/2006	EXAMINER	
VERIZON PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP 1515 N. COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 500 ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909			ENG, DAVID Y	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No. 10/023,297	Applicant(s) VIJAY, SHARADHA	
	Examiner DAVID Y. ENG	Art Unit 2155	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 18 September 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Section 35USC 101 of claims 26-44 and 85.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER


11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With respect to the 102 Rejection of claim 85, Ulrich clearly teaches the method steps. Claim 85 broadly recites two steps, 1. generating an event record labeled as call event record in response to an event, and 2. creating an XML file including the record. With respect to step 1, Ulrich clearly teaches in line 18 of column 3 "records of incoming calls". Although Ulrich does not have the exact claim language of step 1 in column 3, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that in order to have records of incoming calls, it is necessary to create them first. As to creating an XML call event file, Ulrich teaches in lines 58-66 of column 15 that records are in XML format. Although Ulrich does not have in his patent the exact claim language: "creating an XML call event file including the at least one call event record", one of ordinary skill in the art having the Ulrich patent in front of him would readily recognize that records including records of incoming call events in line 18 of column 3 can be an XML record. Because both Applicants and Ulrich can be their own lexicographer, the exact claim language may not be in Ulrich. However, the teaching of claim 85 is in Ulrich.

As to claim 1, Jung clearly teaches "record call information" in response to a call event (step 2) in lines 7-8 of column 11. As to step 3, storing information is an inherent step of recording information. In line 30 of column 30, Jung teaches that the calls are SIP calls. Since there are SIP calls in Jung and the calls are recorded or stored in a file, the section of the file which stores the SIP calls can be said is a SIP section. Jung did not teach that the file which record the calls is in XML. Although Ulrich did not teach recording SIP calls, Ulrich does teach recording calls in XML file. From the combined teaching of Jung and Ulrich, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, rather than to store the SIP call record in ordinary file, to store the SIP call records in XML file to facilitate business transactions and communication as suggested by Ulrich (line 50 column 15). From the teaching of Jung and/or Ulrich, it is not seen how the invention as claimed is patentable distinct over the applied references. No inventive concept is seen. The court held that simply pointing out what a claim requires with no attempt to point out how the claims patentably distinguish over the prior art does not amount to a separate argument for patentability. see In re Nielson, 816 F.2d 1567, 2 USPQ 1525 (Fed. Cir. 1987).



DAVID Y. ENG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER